

The

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re U.S. Patent Application of:

Serial No.: 09/743,938)
Ralf Fuchs et al.)
Filed: March 28, 2001)
Art Unit: 1734)
Examiner: Brenda A. Lamb)
For: DEVICE FOR SIZING A YARN SHEET)
Docket No. 020981.010))
Customer No. 21878	Ì

Charlotte, North Carolina July 13, 2005

Commissioner for Patents Post Office Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

NOTICE UNDER 37 CFR 1.251—Pending Application

This is in response to the Office Action of May 19, 2005 seeking to reconstruct the file of the above-identified application pursuant to the provisions of 37 CFR 1.251.

Remarks begin on page 2 of this paper.

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING:		
EXPRESS MAIL MAILING LABEL NO. EV522805715US		
DATE OF DEPOSIT:	July 13, 2005	
UNITED STATES POSTAL ADDRESSEE" SERVICE U	THIS PAPER OR FEE IS BEING DEPOSITED WITH THE SERVICE "EXPRESS MAIL POST OFFICE TO JINDER 37 CFR 1.10 ON THE DATE INDICATED ABOVE THE COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, POST OFFICE VA 22313-1450	
TYPED NAME:	Marcia Siuda •	
SIGNATURE	Marcia Sud	

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

Approved for use through 07/31/2006.OMB 0651-0031 U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

In re Application of:

Application No.:

Filing Date:

3/28/01

Title:

DEVICE FOR SIZING A FIBRE BUNDLE

Direct to:

U. S. Patent and Trademark Office

Mail Stop: Duplicates Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

NOTICE UNDER 37 CFR 1.251 – Pending Application

Statement (check the appropriate box):

☐ The copy submitted with this reply is a complete and accurate copy of applicant's record of all of the correspondence between the Office and the applicant for the above-identified application (except for U.S. patent documents), and applicant is not aware of any correspondence between the Office and applicant for the above-identified application that is not among applicant's records.

The copy of the paper(s) listed in the notice under 37 CFR 1.251 is/are a complete and accurate copy of applicant's record of such paper(s).

The papers produced by applicant are applicant's complete record of all of the correspondence between the Office and the applicant for the above-identified application (except for U.S. patent documents), and applicant is not aware of any correspondence between the Office and the applicant for the above-identified application that is not among applicant's records.

Applicant does not possess any record of the correspondence between the Office and the applicant for the above identified application.

JULY 13, 2005

Typed or printed name

A Copy of this notice should be returned with the reply.

Burden Hour Statement: This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.251. The information is used by the public to reply to a request for copies of correspondence between the applicant and the USPTO in order to reconstruct an application file. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This form is estimated to take 60 minutes to complete. This time will vary depending upon the needs of the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you are required to complete this form should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 223131450.

PTO Doc Code: R251.RES (Rev. 03/05)

REMARKS

In the Office Action, Applicants have been requested to aid the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO") in reconstructing the above-identified application by supplying a copy of a "Request for Extension of Time," allegedly dated 6/17/04.

4

As indicated in several telephone conversations with personnel in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Applicant has no record of a "Request for Extension of Time" being filed at any time during 2004. More importantly, it is Applicants' belief that no such request was ever made.

More specifically, as discussed (for example) in a telephone conversation with Tracy Hale-Lee (a USPTO employee) on May 13, 2005, the "phantom" request for a time extension stems from an accidental entry, by USPTO personnel, of a three-month extension of time request made sometime after an RCE was initially filed November 18, 2003, and then subsequently refiled on June 17, 2004.

As explained below, no extension of time was necessary at that time, and thus Applicants did not file a request for such an extension. Nonetheless, the USPTO mistakenly entered such a request and debited Applicants' representative's Deposit Account in the amount corresponding to a three-month extension of time request. Applicants' representative subsequently sought, and has received, a refund of this amount, and Applicants believe that this matter has been settled appropriately.

Nonetheless, additional confusion appears to exist with regard to the phantom extension of time request. It is hoped that this written explanation of the events leading to this error will put this matter to rest once and for all.

The confusion itself is resulted from the following circumstances. On August 25, 2003, Applicants filed a response to an Office Action that was dated July 1, 2003. On October 2, 2003, an Advisory Action was mailed; in the Advisory Action, the Examiner refused to enter amendments in the 8/25/03 response. Thus, Applicants re-filed the arguments and amendments in an RCE dated November 18, 2003. However, the USPTO found the RCE to be non-compliant and apparently mailed a notice to that effect on January 12, 2004.

Unfortunately, in the meantime, the Applicants' representative relocated its office and the U.S. Postal Service's forwarding order had expired, so the Notice of Non-Compliant RCE was never received. In a telephone conversation between Applicants' representative and a USPTO representative named Ann Pollard on March 19, 2004, this problem was discussed, and ultimately Ms. Pollard indicated that she would re-mail the Notice and would "re-start" the time period for response to that Notice. A new Notice of Non-Compliant RCE was then mailed on June 10, 2004.

Upon receiving the new Notice of Non-Compliant RCE, Appliants immediately filed an RCE including the arguments and amendments that had previously been filed in the RCE that Applicants had attempted to file on 11/18/03. This was accepted by the USPTO. Further, because it was filed within the period set for reply in the second Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (dated 6/10/04, the period set for reply ending 7/10/04), no extension of time was needed.

Unfortunately, through the error of the USPTO, a three-month extension of time was somehow entered in the file and the deposit account was debited as described above.

Thus, it is Applicants' belief that the sought-for "Request for Extension of Time dated 6/17/04" does not, and has never, existed.

Please contact the undersigned if there are any further questions in this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

James D. Wright

Reg. No. 43,291

Kennedy Covington Lobdell & Hickman, LLP Hearst Tower, 47th Floor 214 North Tryon Street

Charlotte, North Carolina 28202

Telephone (704) 331-7400

-- Attorney for Applicant

Attorney Docket No.: 20981.010